



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ego-narrative as a stock feature of fiction is a safer foundation. From this point, however, Mr. Perry moves with considerable steadiness and assurance. Neukamm had already assembled from the *Asinus* some striking evidence of Lucian's idiosyncrasies of style and phrasing. To these Mr. Perry makes a few but important additions. He observes, for example, that the curiosity which impels Lucius, the hero of the *Asinus*, is also a dominant force in the *Verae Historiae*, and he calls attention to the striking parallelism between *Asinus* 36 and *Dialogus Meretricum* 14.4, in the pun on *δνος* and *δνατο*. The *Asinus*, in brief, contains contradictory elements: a considerable bulk of Lucianic idiom and phraseology combined with alien elements from the Koine. Mr. Perry finds this situation most easily explained by the assumption that Lucian wrote the *Metamorphoses* and that an anonymous epitomizer in the *Asinus* reproduced much of Lucian's style with the infusion of some peculiarities due to the epitomizer's individual qualities. Doubtless, too, some features that are not in accord with Lucian's usual style may be due to the natural adaptation of the style to the subject-matter. In many cases we should be glad to be better informed as to the stylistic and phraseological features of Greek literature in the second century that we might more safely differentiate what is Lucianic from what is broadly characteristic of the Greek of the period. But waiving this objection there is nothing unreasonable in Mr. Perry's suggestion.

But it seems to me that a further step is desirable in the argument. If Lucian is the author of the Greek *Metamorphoses*, we may expect Mr. Perry to study Apuleius's version of the Greek original in the hope of strengthening his contention by the discovery of further traces of Lucian in the Roman adaptation. The parts of Apuleius that correspond to the *Asinus* have been pretty thoroughly examined. But most of the material in Apuleius that is not in the *Asinus* has been regarded as Apuleian interpolation. The argument for this view rests largely upon the loose organic connection of certain stories with the main narrative. But why should we deny to the Greek author such looseness of structure? One who is expert in the style of Lucian and skilled in discerning the Greek behind the masquerade of Latin might appreciably confirm or weaken Mr. Perry's belief that Lucian wrote the Greek original. Such a small matter as the connection between the first sentence of Apuleius's much discussed prooemium and the last sentence of the introduction to Lucian's *Amores* becomes grist for Mr. Perry's mill. And if some of the obvious Grecisms in Apuleius's Latin could be identified as peculiar to Lucian, the argument would be more securely entrenched. In general the matter of the authorship of the Greek *Metamorphoses* seems to me much less important than the problem of Apuleius's relation to Greek sources; and the solution of this problem, I think, is at present unduly hampered by unnecessary hypotheses and prejudices.

Mr. Perry takes up other aspects of the Greek works, into which I must not go. I cannot believe

that either the *Asinus* or Apuleius's tale justifies a view that there was primarily a satirical purpose in any of the works involved. We must recognize the existence, as a Greek type, of a humorous fictitious narrative of adventure, written in the first person, in which the content is mainly concerned with the marvellous and the paradoxical. The relation of this type to other kinds of fictitious narrative is a topic one may profitably let alone for the present. The length of the Greek *Metamorphoses* Mr. Perry seems to me to underestimate, but I am doubtless affected by my willingness to believe that Apuleius provides more of the Greek original than most scholars admit. The dissertation is seldom marred by any positive errors of statement, but the unqualified assertion that Aristophanes and Euripides wrote dramas before they were twenty would bear a little revision.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

The Indicative Indirect Question in Latin. By Alice Freda Bräunlich. University of Chicago Dissertation. Private edition, distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago, Illinois (1920). Pp. xxxi + 211.

This investigation, inspired by Professor W. G. Hale, was as a dissertation limited to the Latin of the Republican period, but was later almost doubled in size by the addition of a second part, dealing with the later literature. The bibliography indicates the authors whose works were examined in whole or in part, and impresses the reviewer with the wide extent of the author's first-hand study in the subject; but it is somewhat astonishing to find that Tacitus was among those whose works were examined only in part.

The Introduction reviews previous studies on the same subject, and sets forth the purposes and the methods of the present study. The author's fairness is notable. After collecting the apparent examples of the indicative indirect question, she attempted "to interpret every one of the examples otherwise than as an indirect question: as a direct question, as a relative clause, as a condition, or in any other conceivable way" (xxviii). Those more easily classified otherwise were cast aside, and the remainder were divided into (a) indeterminate examples, which might equally well be felt as indirect questions or as something else, and (b) apparently certain examples of the indicative indirect question. The indeterminate examples were further classified by the alternative constructions, and also as to whether they were really indeterminate or more naturally to be understood as indirect questions.

The difficulty was to arrive at objective criteria in these decisions, but the author is fully alive to this and has worked out a formulation of indications that questions are indirect, rather than indirectly quoted (24 f.), that clauses are indirect questions rather than exclamations (31-33), or than relative clauses (52-56).

or than conditions (79 f.), amplified later in Chapter VII (87-95). No other portion of the investigation impresses the reviewer so thoroughly with the author's clearness of thought as the formulation of these criteria, which must be studied with utmost care for proper appreciation; space prevents their enumeration here.

In the classification of examples the author takes the sane view that another scholar would doubtless classify some of her examples differently, but that the essential validity of her classification would not thereby be affected, since the greatest number of them would remain as she has placed them. In fact, she says, she has weakened her case by conservatism, rather than open the way to hostile criticism (159), and has classed, as probable instances merely, a number of clauses where others see certain examples of the indicative in indirect questions. In view of this, the reviewer is not inclined to enter into a discussion of some few passages where he would interpret in a different way, but wishes to express his sense of satisfaction with the investigation as one careful in method and in execution and answering in advance the criticisms which might be aimed at it.

The following results might be enumerated:

(1) The indicative occurs in a considerable number of indirect questions at all periods and in all styles.

(2) It is therefore unjustifiable to emend from our texts such indicatives where they are confirmed by the manuscript tradition.

(3) Further, the copyist of a manuscript would be more likely to change an indicative in an indirect question to a subjunctive, than to make the reverse change, so that our texts are more likely to have lost indicative indirect questions than to have gained them by the errors of the scribes.

(4) The indicative in the indirect question is more common in conversational and inelegant styles than in literary and elegant styles.

(5) The indicative in the indirect question occurs more often in early and in late Latin than in the Ciceronian and early Imperial times.

(6) It is not an archaism nor is it a Grecism, though its use in some writers (e. g. in certain Christian writers) may have been favored by the identical construction in Greek.

(7) The indicative in the indirect question is found, in the Republican and Augustan periods, almost exclusively in clauses which depend on primary tenses; later, it occurs not too infrequently depending on secondary tenses.

(8) It is quite possible that the indicative used in indirect questions of fact in the Romance Languages is based upon a genuine popular Latin use, despite Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des Langues Romanes*, § 665.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

ROLAND G. KENT

#### THE COLLEGE TEACHER OF LATIN

Professor Knapp's comments, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.161-162, upon an article entitled A

Course of Study for the Training of College Teachers of Latin, contributed by Professor Frederick M. Foster, of the University of Wyoming, to School and Society 13. 268-270, have interested me greatly. I have often thought, from my own experience, that some work in methods of teaching, and some practice-teaching would be very helpful to the graduate student who has never taught. Possibly as much time as is given ordinarily to two one-term courses might be used for the purpose. I am ready also to admit that the student, trained as Professor Foster would have him trained, might, *ceteris paribus*, get on better in his teaching for the first year or two. So far I will go with Professor Foster, but no further.

A College teacher must of course have a respectable command of his subject. He ought to be able to bring to his students new material, his own ideas. He ought to be master of some general field. He ought to be able to criticize intelligently the opinions set forth, and the statements of fact made, in the text-books which his students use. Mr. Foster's course could not put a man in such a position. At best he might become an interesting dealer-out of other men's opinions. Mr. Foster wants interesting teaching; but a man who does not command his field can hardly be vitally interesting. He can hardly be interested himself, since he is simply accepting and transmitting work done by others.

One detail I may add. It would be entertaining—whether it would be profitable or not—to see worked out a good course in Introduction to Methods of Research (Latin), such as Professor Foster talks about, which would run for one hour per week through one year, and should acquaint one with "the major fields of Latin research, such as epigraphy, paleography, text criticism, etc.". It would be a bowing acquaintance which would not be likely to ripen into intimacy.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA,  
CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

G. A. HARRER

The *Rhetorica* of Philodemus. Translation and commentary, by Harry M. Hubbell. Transactions of The Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 23. 248-382. New Haven, Connecticut (September, 1920).

In the excavations at Herculaneum in the eighteenth century there were found numerous charred papyrus rolls which contained philosophical and rhetorical writings of the Epicurean School. These were largely works of Philodemus, a native of Gadara, a disciple of Zeno at Athens, and a client of Piso at Rome. Philodemus seems to have been active in literary circles at Rome and to have known Horace, Vergil, Varius, and Quintilian, and to have influenced their writings, (this view recent investigation makes probable). He is also the Epicurean philosopher attacked by Cicero in his *Oratio In Pisonem*.

The fragments of the *Rhetorica* have been collected in the edition of Sudhaus. They are in a wretched state of preservation and present great difficulty to the interpreter. Professor Hubbell in this work aims to give "a systematic presentation of the rhetorical fragments of Philodemus, with an interpretation of the more important passages". The author disclaims finality in the interpretation because of the imperfect condition of the text, and essays a paraphrase rather than a translation. He is to be thanked for attempting this task of such difficulty. His work will be of interest and value to scholars in this field.

BARNARD COLLEGE  
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

LARUE VAN HOOK